

FLOOR SCHEDULE FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2013

HOUSE MEETS AT:	FIRST VOTE PREDICTED:	LAST VOTE PREDICTED:
9:00 a.m.: Legislative Business Five "One Minutes" per side	9:30 – 10:30 a.m.	12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

****Members are advised that first votes are possible as early as 9:30 a.m. today.**

Complete Consideration of [H.R. 1947](#) – Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act (Rep. Lucas – Agriculture). This bill extends most major federal farm, nutrition assistance, rural development and agricultural trade programs through FY 2018 — but repeals or modifies certain major programs, including dairy programs, and direct payments to farmers.

It repeals direct and countercyclical payments to agriculture commodity producers and replaces them with new risk-management programs to protect farmers when they suffer losses. It also repeals several major dairy programs and replaces them with a new program to manage the supply of dairy products, it expands crop insurance coverage, and it consolidates major conservation programs.

According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the bill would reduce spending by \$33.3 billion (plus about \$6 billion in savings from sequestration) over 10 years compared to the baseline, including a reduction of \$20.5 billion to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). The bill significantly restricts so-called "categorical eligibility" for SNAP, under which individuals become eligible for SNAP benefits based on their participation in other low-income assistance programs. This would result in the loss of SNAP benefits for about 2 million Americans (and eliminate school lunch eligibility for about 210,000 children). Changes in the bill to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)/SNAP interaction would also cut benefits for about 1.7 million Americans.

As of last night, the House had completed debate on amendments through the Flores amendment (#97). There are 5 amendments remaining to debate, each debatable for 10 minutes, except for amendments offered by Mr. Pitts of Pennsylvania and Mr. Goodlatte of Virginia, which are debatable for 20 minutes, equally controlled by the proponent and opponent of the amendment.

The following amendments had recorded votes pending as of last night:

- Brooks Amendment
- Conaway Amendment
- Butterfield Amendment
- Marino Amendment #26
- Schweikert Amendment
- Tierney Amendment
- Polis Amendment
- Garamendi Amendment
- Marino Amendment #41
- McClintock Amendment
- Gibson Amendment
- Walorski Amendment
- Courtney Amendment
- Kind Amendment
- Carney Amendment
- Radel Amendment
- Walberg Amendment

A full list of the 103 amendments made in order can be found [HERE](#).

Bill Text for H.R. 1947:

[PDF Version](#)

Background for H.R. 1947:

[House Report \(HTML Version\)](#)

[CRS Report:](#) The 2013 Farm Bill: A Comparison of the Senate-Passed Bill ([S. 954](#)) and House-Reported Bill (H.R. 1947) with Current Law

The Daily Quote

"Will John Boehner break the Hastert rule and bring an immigration reform bill to the floor even if a majority of House Republicans oppose it? 'It's not gonna happen,' he said Tuesday. My colleague... thinks he's bluffing. And perhaps he is. But at this point, even Boehner doesn't know if he's bluffing or not. He doesn't know what his cards will be... But most House Republicans don't want to make the Hastert rule into an actual rule. And the reason, as they'll tell you behind closed doors, is that it's not Boehner who breaks the Hastert rule. He'd never send a bill to the floor if a majority of House Republicans didn't want to see it on the floor. It's the House Republicans who break the Hastert rule. The reality of the House is that sometimes a majority of House Republicans want a bill to pass even if they don't want to vote for it. They broke the Hastert rule to pass the 'fiscal cliff' deal. Then they broke it again to pass an aid package after Hurricane Sandy. And then they broke it again when they passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women's Act. What all these bills had in common was that they presented Republicans with a collective action problem. It was better for House Republicans if the bills passed. But it was also better for a majority of House Republicans to vote against the bills. That might be because they oppose the bill ideologically or because they're worried about primary challenges or because they think their constituents will punish them. Whatever the reason, breaking the Hastert rule allows them to have it both ways: Republicans can vote against the bills, but the bills can pass anyway."

- Ezra Klein, Washington Post, 6/18/13